DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 589 EA 012 395

AUTHOR Knezevich, S. J.
TITLE Evolution of Faculty-Principal Relations: A Look at What's Happening from the National Perspective. Educational Services Bulletin No. 53.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Bureau of Educational Research and Services.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Role; Collective Bargaining; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; *Principals; *Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

As well as looking at the historic development of faculty-principal relations, this paper focuses on current changes in and challenges to the principal's role. The paper contends that faculty-principal relations are central to what happens in education. It maintains that dramatic changes in schools demand new value orientations and styles of administration from principals. Most profound appear to be the changes in administrator power and role brought about by teachers' unions. Yet, the author maintains that a "new breed" of principals will have the ability to successfully meet these challenges. Characteristics of this new type of administrator include the ability to avoid "administrivia," to analyze educational problems, to continually learn new competencies, and to visualize the school system as a living organism. Principals will be mediators of conflict, will be able to manage change, will coordinate specialists, and will be neither frightened nor foolhardy in the face of violence. Finally, the author concludes that future leadership will be in a different style but it will still be in demand and of importance. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181589

Evolution of Faculty-Principal Relations:

A LOOK AT WHAT'S HAPPENING FROM THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

By
S. J. KNEZEVICH
Dean, School of Education
University of Southern California

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Educational Services Bulletin No. 53

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Carey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by

College of Education
Bureau of Educational Research and Services
Merwin Deever, Director

Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281
June, 1976

EA 012 395

Foreword

The role of the principal has long been characterized as that of the instructional leader and the principal's leadership has been vital to the success and the effectiveness of the school. The principalship is one of the oldest school administrative positions but with increasing demands and pressures from many divergent sources placed upon the principal there is some question as to the future of the principal and the principalship. The challenges, problems and rewards of this "middle management" responsibility are no longer in direct relationship and the job satisfactions are threatened to a considerable extent.

The key to the future of the school principalship and to education is inherent in the faculty-principal relations.

This paper is addressed to the historical development of faculty-principal relations and the criticality of strong principalships at the unit school level. Principals and all other educators will read this paper with great interest and be challenged by its insights.

MD

Evolution of Faculty-Principal Relations:

A Look At What's Happening From the National Perspective

S. J. KNEZEVICH
Dean, School of Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

In our nation there exists the implicit belief that somehow more and better schooling will improve social status, increase economic rewards, and, generally, lead to a richer, fuller life. Therefore, when some person or group feels that the good life passed them by, there is the propensity to place the blame on someone other than themselves. The schools often are first to suffer for shortcomings, real or imagined, experienced by someone.

The educational battles confronting our nation must be placed in perspective. They focus on how to further improve the most comprehensive system of schools the world has ever known. It is growing expectations, that is, a demand for more rather than the struggle to establish the basic rudiments of elementary and secondary education that triggers confrontations. In short, it is quality and not simply availability that stimulates the great educational debates of our period. An educational system forced to radically alter basic traditions and then redesigned to do more than transmit the cultural heritage cannot avoid criticisms. Such criticisms intensify when the schools endeavor to contribute more directly to the resolution of controversies in civil rights and other social issues. Educational systems under such conditions may become politically explosive.

The educational attainment of the nation as a whole is high and illiteracy low. No other nation in history can match what is soon to become, if it isn't a fact now, a universal system of community college education. No school system other than our own has dared to try to educate the bottom fraction of the normal curve: most focus on those with an aptitude to learn and with home support for learning. Educators are held responsible for children and youth who don't go to schools as well as those who do. Schooling has become a right, not simply a privilege or opportunity that the recipient must earn. No dropouts is a demanding goal. The zero rejection standard is tough to meet where serious constraints are placed on resources allocated to

public schools. The many educational accomplishments of our culture are not catalogued to boast, nor to signal a time for smug self-satisfaction, but rather to place criticisms in their proper perspective. Whatever may have been our past national educational achievements and however good we look in comparison to developed and underdeveloped nations of the world, we still have not reached the quality level necessary to satisfy the present needs of the clientele served.

The Principal and the Brave New World

Those whose professional lives are tied to the educational enterprise find themselves ensnarled in struggles over who controls schools, what shall be the new priorities for education or how we can accomplish greater involvement of teachers through formal organizations in school operations. Educational confrontations of whatever type and intensity soon find their way to the principal's office. Yes, it is true that the social, political, and economic forces changing schools in so many ways also end up redefining the roles of the chief executive officer of the learning center. As a result new competencies are demanded. It is at the attendance center level of a school system where students, teachers and the community interact. Here, to borrow from a well-known ad, is "where the rubber meets the road." Inevitably, policies, whether stimulated by federal pressures, the stress of strikes, or calm deliberations at school board meetings, have an impact on classroom activities in each attendance center. It is at this level of school operation where the lion's share of services of professional personnel are performed and where material resources are consumed to attain the goals of education. Let there be no mistake, the principalship is where the action is. This is where most of the confrontations brew and the collisions occur. What is settled at the negotiation table before or after a bitter strike is implemented where the teachers perform.

Over one weekend some years ago, Washington, D.C. newspapers devoted three separate articles on the constant threat of violence in city and suburban schools. They described school bank robberies that seem to occur about once a month. There was even a killing of an assistant principal during one such robbery of the School bank. Purse snatchings in school cafeterias were called a common and daily event somewhere in the system. The demand for greater police protection of school children from other students and frequenters was a familiar outcry. The principal in large urban centers is beset and barraged by what the media calls "harassing and exasperating encounters". The principalship is a highly visible and, therefore, very vulnerable position in American school administration. It is also very important to the success of education. The prime challenge facing this position is to make sure that the schools are not destroyed by violence nor captured by the violent no matter how deeply the violent feel.

The school principalship is one of the oldest educational adminis-

trative positions, much older than the superintendency. It was born in a classroom setting and stayed there for much of its history. The non-teaching principal is a comparatively recent development. Principals and teachers remained in close working and professional relationship through most of history.

The principal played many different roles in education during much of its 500 year history. This is a very long time, but keep in mind that the mighty dinosaurs were around for about 45 million years and dominated other life forms for most of that period. The failure to recognize the signals that new competencies and insights are demanded for survival can be just as fatal to the principalship as it was to the dinosaur when it faced a dramatically changing environment. Whether the principalship will survive, and let us hope that the goal is not merely survival, and in what form is more than an academic question to more than 100,000 now dedicating their professional lives to it. No principalship is an island. There is no justification for establishing this administrative position without a number of teachers. Inherent in this position is the demand that he work with others to accomplish objectives. His effectiveness is measured by interactions or impact on others. Faculty-principal relations are crucial to what happens in education.

Theseus and the Procrustean Bed

Let me indulge in a bit of symbolism to portray some kinds of challenges confronting the principalship. It may be recalled that among the Greek myths is a saga that starts with Aegeus, King of Athens. As a young man he journeyed to another land where he fell in love and married a beautiful princess. The marriage was blessed shortly with a son named Theseus. Not long after his son arrived the father, for reasons unknown and unexplained by mythologists, returned alone to his kingdom of Athens. Before departing, he concealed his sword and sandals beneath a large stone. To his beautiful and dutiful wife he declared, "When Theseus comes of age and acquires strength, let him lift the huge rock, take ownership of my sword and sandals and come join me in Athens. He shall be introduced there to my people and acclaimed my son and heir."

Years passed and brought to Theseus, as I'm sure they do to many principals, strength, beauty, and wisdom. His mother directed him to the spot where his father's trusty weapons lay, recited his father's wish, and bade him try his strength. With one mighty effort Theseus raised the rock. To his great satisfaction sword and sandals were preserved in perfect condition. With sword in hand, Theseus set out for Athens.

Along the way he encountered monsters who did their best to bar progress and delay passage. In one famous adventure he encountered a notorious character who, under the pretext of entertainment, deluded travelers into entering his home. The culprit, called Procrustes and nicknamed the "Stretcher", subjected his unsuspect-

ing guests to a number of indignities. One version of the myth related that the wicked Procrustes employed a single rigid bed to satisfy his evidently sick sense of humor. He would place the unwilling guest upon the bed and force compliance to the precise dimensions of the bed. If too, short, the person was streteched until his legs fit the bed perfectly. If too long, Procrustes cut off the limbs to satisfy the rigid and inflexible specifications. You might in today's terminology state that the bed was made relevant by modifying the physical characteristics of the individual using it. It is obvious that the guest was involved as well. Legend has it that our mighty Theseus was too strong and wiley to suffer the indignities of ordinary mortals. Instead he turned tables and forced Procrustes to lie down upon his own bed to experience the suffering inflicted upon others. After that Theseus put an end to the wretched existence of that inflexible, arbitrary and insensitive rascal.

From this well known myth came the concept of the Procrustean bed. We would have been indebted forever to dear Theseus had he destroyed any and all forms of the Procrustean bed. Evidently, there remain followers of Procrustes who were missed by Theseus, for similar behavior is not uncommon today. A school may be a Procrustean bed, that is, an inflexible mold into which every learner, every professional relationship is poured no matter what the needs, capabilities, or environment of those involved.

Preconceived and untested ideas of what everyone must learn, how all must behave, or how the faculty must relate to the principals; inflexible procedures which everyone must follow slavishly; and arbitrary demands which everyone must obey without question provide the substance of modern Procrustean beds as well. Attendance centers cannot gain relevance by imposing conformity or by ignoring shifting values among the student and faculty populations and emerging societal demands. Students with very limited mental ability or disadvantaged backgrounds may be stretched to the point of emotional pain and frustration when forced to satisfy rigid academic demands. On the opposite side of the spectrum, high ability learners may have exciting interests subdued and great capabilities undernourished where rigid educational doctrines prevail. The principal may play, inadvertently or otherwise, the role of Procrustes and contribute to generation of inflexible operations, or he may assume the role of Theseus and put an end to learning centers that are not relevant to the clientele served or the faculty employed.

It is out of Procrustean beds that conflicts with the community, confrontations with teachers, and communication breakdown with pupils are born. The program, the value orientation, the daily routines that work well in one era or with one type of student or faculty may fail miserably when the community changes and people with a significantly different socioeconomic, cultural, or racial background replace

the previously dominant population group. Mobility does strange things to school attendance centers. Witness the core cities. In the space of 25 years they tumbled from being the locus of the finest educational opportunities available anywhere in the world to the abysmal depths of being criticized as the most troubled educational operations in the nation. Granted that overreaction and distortion may account for much of the image change, nevertheless, no one will deny the magnitude of the problems confronting large urban centers.

Let no principal in affluent suburbs or small attendance centers delude himself into believing "it can't happen here." It may be true that what is being experienced in the large urban settings elsewhere may not be even sensed in Arizona. This is not to suggest that such dramatic changes will not strike Arizona at any time in the future. American cities were a dominant force for improvements in education for 150 years before the more recent turn of events. Attendance centers anywhere can change dramatically. Confrontations may be the first sign that the school faces a different environment while the principal continues to cling to value orientations and styles of administration that belong to another era. Procrustean beds have been justified by more than one person on the grounds that things worked wonderfully well in the good old days, so why change to untested new ideas?

The Changing Demands and New Roles

Many forces are remolding the missions of school attendance centers and thereby recasting the many faceted roles of the school principal. How he or she relates to the faculty is no exception. Specialization within the profession, complexity of social institutions in today's troubled society, vacillating growth rates, greater propensity of those outside the established power structure to take to the streets to dramatize their demands, violence and the rising expectations for education combine to demand a new configuration for today's effective school administrator. The justification for any administrative position lies in its contributions to the objectives satisfied. If we can operate institutions just as well without administrators as with them, there would be little justification for such posts. What is demanded of administrators by the institution will change with the clientele served, the orientations of employees, and the general environment facing the organization.

Let us assume that a high school student experienced a few problems, but suddenly all these struck at one time: his parents were killed in an auto accident, there were difficulties in classes, he acquired an unfortunate disease, and he felt compelled to demonstrate to make "pot" legal. Would the troubled student be likely to go to his high school principal for advice on how he might find solace for his sorrows, expression for his deep feelings, and a way out of his awesome problems? The confused and sensitive student would have

to perceive his principal as the wise, venerable, understanding, compassionate "Mr. Chips" to consider him as source of guidance during times he needed help the most. The romance that surrounds the principalship is derived in large part from the counseling role executed by that warm, friendly, lovable "Mr. Chips". He was able to sense the best in every pupil and exhibited the wisdom of Solomon in extricating the immature adolescent from his never ending predicaments.

The reverse is more likely to be the pattern. Pupils are more likely to perceive the principal as an authority figure to be confronted with demands rather than a warm counselor sought during times of difficult problems. Incidentally, the legal interpretations have abandoned traditional norms which tended to support the side of authority and switched to favor those subjected to authority. Furthermore, the huge size of most secondary schools today makes it impossible for any one man to reach out and know in an intimate way two or three thousand students. Specialization has brought forth the counselor, or at least the counselor-teacher, to assume all if not the major roles of that romantic headmaster figure Mr. Chips. Although the in loco parentis concept has cast the principal in the "big daddy" role, the generation gap has made things as difficult in schools as in homes. Even at the elementary level, the principal is perceived more as an authority figure to be feared than a kind friend to be consulted.

Would the teacher feeling an economic pinch, faced with an unusually complex concept to teach, or confronted with a pupil who is most difficult to reach turn to the principal as professional colleague and instructional leader? The textbooks respond in the affirmative. The old headmaster knew more about each school subject and was able to teach it better than any teacher on the staff. The principal was idealized as the reincarnation of the master-teacher. Is this realistic or are present-day administrators suffering from a delusion? I believe that the principal must remain dedicated to making great teaching possible. Releasing the creative energies of special and regular teachers is at the heart of the instructional leadership role.

The Organized Profession and the Principal

The great expansion of knowledge and more extensive professional preparation prior to entry into practice makes it impossible for any single administrator to know every subject offered in secondary schools as well as, if not better than, the person credentialed and employed to teach a special subject. Special subject consultants, or supervisors, are more likely to be tapped by teachers as resource persons, as professional counselors on instructional problems, rather than the principal. The more realistic role of the principal as an instructional leader is to gather or make available to teachers the specialized instructional resources demanded. Unfortunately, teachers have not received such services from most and, therefore,

tend to perceive the principal as monitor of the status quo, a formal evaluator, a taskmaster, an overseer, a faculty disciplinarian or simply the authority figure in the building. In some cases, egged on by a few union officials, teachers may view principals and other administrators as enemies rather than professional colleagues; "they" rather than "us." The more militant prefer to by-pass or ignore him by negotiating welfare and instructional changes directly with the Board of Education.

It is a bit of an exaggeration to suggest that the mood of much of the teaching profession, nationally, is to emphasize occupational security and to stress improved economic status of the profession. The vehicle to achieve those objectives is more often than not, "Mother NEA" rather than "Father employer." The new "matriarchy" of united professional peers supersedes and overcomes the domination by the old "patriarchy" of the employer-administrator. In earlier days job security for teachers was enhanced through state laws which demanded that employing school district accept such provisions as continuing contracts, tenure, and salary schedules. Educational organizations today place less emphasis on specific state legislation to promote the economic status of teachers and more on dynamic action in protecting rights to job security and economic rewards through collective bargaining. The focus is more on what happens at the negotiating table rather than in the halls of the legislature. The principal, although in daily contact with teachers is viewed by teachers as an individual not likely to influence state legislation in behalf of teachers and not likely to have a significant impact at the bargaining table. What's more, if he does appear at the table he is seen as part of the employer or administrative team rather than as a representative of teachers.

The individual teacher, therefore, over the past decade turns to the power of the education organization to redress grievances, to gain better working conditions, or greater economic benefits rather than to individual principals. This is clearly a national trend and, perhaps one of the most significant trends in the history of the education profession. This has brought unions or associations to seek control over medical insurance benefits processing, disbursement of retirement benefits and the building of homes for retired teachers. All teachers, whether members of the professional union or not, would come to the association or union headquarters to obtain claim blanks, to process claims, and to receive funds due under any claim. The new doxology appears to be "praise the education organization from whom all blessings flow." The traditional educational leader, and the principal belongs in this group, has lost, or is losing rapidly, the image as faculty spokesman and source of inspiration and benefits for teachers. The organized profession has become more militant, has gained confidence that teachers can speak for themselves, and is no

longer afraid to take what previously may have been considered extreme action.

One's social life is often determined by his occupational choice. A side effect, if not the main one for some, from attendance at education conferences is the opportunity to socialize with professional peers. Often the rewards, other than economic, desired by the professional are controlled by the professional society. Every educational organization has a system of awards for the faithful. Esteem-orientation, that is recognition from his peers, is a force of importance in determining the behavior of teachers as well as others.

Forging New Relationships

All this suggests that there are forces which have been operative for at least a decade. They may even portend troubled days ahead in faculty-principal relations. Again, what may be evident nationally may not have hit Arizona as yet. Keep in mind that others have said "It can't happen here." It did and it will come to Arizona sooner or later. Historically, teachers and principals were very close. They are now drifting apart. They cannot stay apart for very long for one needs the other. There is a need to create a new basis for professional understanding and working relationships. At least a portion of the responsibility and authority principals enjoyed in working with teachers in pre-negotiation days in most states has been eroded. Teachers demand and now have access to the tables where the highest-level decisions are being made. They turn to their organizations to obtain power to circumvent the principal's office. Why bother to consult middle management if you have access to the top? With his leadership role with the professional staff lessened to some degree by the emergence of special-subject supervisors and his authority over other operations reduced somewhat by specifications in a negotiated work contract, some believe that what is left is simply the emaciated remains of an administrator with relatively meager influence over the course of education within attendance center. I do not believe that this pessimistic interpretation has validity. By the same token, I argue that it is wishful thinking to believe that the old values and patterns will rise again. New competencies and fresh outlooks represent the key to future leadership roles for the principal.

The following story from the Washington Post news article illustrates an abortive effort but which dramatized, nonetheless, what's happening. The article described the recommendations of the Washington, D.C. Teachers Union during negotiations for the 1969-70 work contract. The union proposed a teacher be designated as "instructional leader." This would effectively by-pass the principal for a teacher would serve as the liaison between the school's faculty and system's Division of Instruction. One of the most cherished and historic roles, if not the fundamental justification, of the principal is that of instructional leader. The union's conceptualization of "instruc-

tional leader" would be a teacher not a principal, who would serve two years and, of course, be relieved of teaching duties for the period. "Teacher power", often interpreted as teacher control over some traditional administrator responsibility rather than increased salaries alone, has been a key issue during negotiations. Even though the "instructional leader" concept had little success in 1969-70, it is bound to reappear. I believe that principals should be greatly concerned about the possible erosion of their instructional leadership role.

A teacher's entry into the profession, subsequent professional behavior, rewards, job protection, welfare, and social life may be influenced in large part by what I call the "Education Profession Subculture." By that I mean that the value orientations of the professional are determined by the organization with which affiliated. The education organization will influence to a great degree what happens in the teachers professional sub-culture no matter what principals say or do. Obviously, if it is true that the "Education Profession Sub-culture" has a decisive impact on teachers, then the traditional teacher-principal interactions and relationships will be subjected to drastic modification.

As late as 1969-70, 72% of school-districts tied the principal's salary to teacher salary schedules. You might say principals benefited when teachers won new salary gains. But 5 years later only 36%, a 50% reduction, related what the principal earned to what the teacher received. This national trend will continue and before this decade is out, the salary of principals will be unrelated to what teachers receive. This, too, portends an increasing feeling of separation among principals and teachers.

It's not surprising that many principals react with confusion and uncertainty in an environment that has undergone dramatic changes during the past decade. This is demonstrated rather vividly when something as traumatic as a school strike hits a system. Principals may be at a loss as to what to do when a strike is a reality. Some principals continue to view themselves more as extensions of teachers, or at least instructional supervisors, rather than as members of the administrative team. The Florida strike in the late 1960s is a case in point. Some principals walked out in sympathy with teachers. Their reward for such action was dismissal by boards and superintendents or at least loss of confidence by the people in the community served by the principal. The people, the boards and the superintendents felt that the allegiance of the principal belonged with administrators and not the teaching faculty. The superintendent and boards were willing to forgive teachers for striking but not principals. The net result was that many teachers returned after the strike but many principals who walked out with them were not invited back to an administrative post.

Principals have become unsure as to which side of the bargaining

table they belong. In face of this dilemma some principals seek to generate a new power base in dealing with boards and superintendents by adopting a bargaining mode of their own. Principals particularly in the very large urban districts, have organized their own union and as such affiliated with a national group such as the Teamsters Union. Whether this presages a national trend is not clear even at this late date.

There can be no question that the propensity of teachers to use their professional associations or unions as they were never used before, to resort to strikes and to insist on bargaining has had a profound impact on teacher-principal relations. Let's look at what happens after a strike. It is the principal who bears the full brunt of healing wounds, restoring pleasant working relations, repairing damage to pupil learning as quickly as possible, and adjusting to new conditions spelled out by the negotiated contract. The principal will always be destined to meet teachers daily on a face to face basis. Adversaries during a strike become fellow professionals after the strike. These are traumatic role changes to execute.

To many people in the community, the principal is the most visible school representative. He was perceived as a master educator, the man to see when things were to be accomplished. In an organized society, the limitations of one individual in a given locale become evident. More and more the community turned away from the local administrator in favor of the board of education. The bypassing of the principal's office relieves some pressures, but at the expense of reducing the stature of a previously conceived hero figure. There is a loneliness that comes to the man at the top. But all is not lost.

The New Breed

I shall not belabor the point that a new set of professional values abounds in education. The traditional roles are not enough and are found wanting. It is a fact that the demands on the office often outstrip time available. Obviously, there is the need to have the ability to organize the school day to maximize accomplishments of high priority concerns that really make a difference in the school. The new breed of principal must avoid the "administrativia trap", that is, allowing precious time to be lost in activities that could be done just as well by secretaries or subprofessionals. Counting lunch money, taking tickets at basketball games or completing routine reports by hand can take time away from more important leadership roles.

A second characteristic of the new breed is the development of abilities to determine where the School in particular and education in general are going. The special competencies of writing quality and measurable objectives are important to the new breed. Living by such directions is of no less concern.

The new breed will also have the capability to analyze and appraise educational problems. Along the way he or she will be unafraid to ask

of themselves as well as others what may seem to be embarrassing questions.

Lastly, among the more obvious and general characteristics of the new breed of principals is a dedication to a lifetime of professional learning. No set of competencies will last forever. There are new ones to gain and existing ones to sharpen or modify.

Harrassment of the administrator caught in the middle takes many different forms. There may be picketing, unjustified accusations, court actions, blacklisting, and exclusions from councils where important decisions and policies are made. Educational leaders in administrative positions must demonstrate the capacity to deal with the unruly forces in the community with divergent social pressures and facing economic and political strife. It is not enough to cope successfully in the traditional roles of opening school, scheduling, budgeting, or revising the curriculum. The traditional conceptions of this office are in question. If the principalship does endure radical surgery what will it be like? What will be the level of effectiveness, or stated another way, the sphere of influence in school operations? Where is the new breed of principal to draw his or her strength, value orientations and professional inspiration in a world where the strong are chopped down at the ankles, old values are shattered with regularity, and professional relationships may seem confused?

It is my contention that neither ignorance of educational operations, insensitivity to the dimensions of the problems facing the principalship, nor naive amateurism can save the day no matter how bright the alleged new breed. More than sheer intellectual brillance is required for success in administration. Only 1 in 8 of the bright young people make it.

I also refute the claim that the messiah for the school principalship will come from outside education, that is, those who are experienced and professionally prepared in education will be succeeded by those who were managers or non-managers in non-educational institutions. Futhermore, the concept that those outside of education are more likely to succeed as principals is more of an anachronism than an innovation. It is a historical fact that the breed of unprepared, inexperienced, and non-professionals was given an opportunity to display their talents in less hectic times. They were found wanting. A retreat once again to such an alleged solution would merely exacerbate the situation. The modern equivalent of this idea can be traced back to at least 25 years ago.

The new breed of administrators will come to visualize the school system as a living organism. It is created, experiences growing pains, and suffers maladjustments. New positions and different relationships will evolve. It is argued by some that school administrators are destined to be displaced by victorious teacher committees assuming administrative functions or by non-educators appointed by the board

for coping with negotiation. I don't believe it. On the contrary, efforts to do so will make the conflicts more intense, confusion even greater, and catastrophe more likely.

Making the Impossible Possible

The principalship will survive as a position because a complex and multipurpose educational system cannot even approximate, much less achieve, goals without them. It is true that individuals without the requisite competencies may not endure in such posts, but the principalship as a position in the educational hierarchy will continue. There is no satisfactory alternative to it. I believe that the principalship will not only survive but that it is a many splendored thing — a multifaceted position. Existing textbooks fail to reflect its many facets.

The office is not unlike a pressure cooker and is destined to remain so. The telephone in that office sometimes has all the characteristics of a panic button. What are some new trusts which hold promise for the principalship? What kinds of more specific competencies are needed by a person in a position that is threatened by violence from within and without? How does one keep pace and stay ahead of dramatic changes?

First of all a basic premise. One person alone can no longer generate the breakthroughs to new high ground. The principalship, if it is to cope with existing conditions, is conceived better as a cluster of positions designed to lead and administer in a complex attendance center and an even more complicated environment. There may be a place in this interdisciplinary team configuration for the bright man with a specialization outside the field of education, that is, who did not experience the trials and tribulations of classroom teaching as a training ground or sensitizer to future roles in the attendance center. The illumination and resolution of problems will call for many efforts to resolve them. The principalship will be an impossible position if we insist that only one man shall be assigned to the office. Adequate and differentiated staffing patterns can make it a viable office.

It is my opinion that the principalship is not an island but a part of a total district system of administration. The principal is part of the superintendent's team. The focus on what shall be done within the principalship and/or attendance center should not obscure how the principal is related to other administrators in the system.

The power of ideas is stronger than power of office, tradition, or personality alone. The salvation lies in competencies not authority. What are these?

Some general ones were mentioned earlier. If conflict is a signature of the times then a major contribution of the principal will be that of a mediator among conflicting forces that tend to shape the direction of education. Change is the name of the game, as well. The principal, if success is desired, must have the competencies to manage all dimensions of innovation with a minimum of dysfunctions. A new and

meaningful pattern of relationships will emerge between teachers and principals, students and principals to replace the shattered traditional ones. A principal will no longer be judged effective if only the status quo is maintained in an efficient manner. He will be called upon to help select those innovations most likely to contribute to the goals of education. In this age of over-write and under-think some may seek change for the sake of change without acknowledging that innovations are designed to improve and not simply to be boasted about. The principal must accept the role of the prime change agent in the system.

Teaching specialists at the classroom level and supervisory specialists at the central office level are also a fact of life for the chief executive at the building level. The principal of large and small attendance centers cannot discharge leadership responsibilities by supervising and consulting with every teacher in every area of specialization at the attendance center. He is better conceived as an executive who makes things happen by marshalling the resources demanded for effective operations and meaningful innovation. The principal will have a contribution to make if he or she coordinates the specialists and insures that no speciality within the school is pursued for its own sake. Specialization, and its coordination, must be shown to contribute to more effective instruction and better realization of the needs of pupils and community served by the attendance unit. The principal must be the prime advocate for the promotion of learning. It is obvious that sensitivity to human relationships has high priority where conflicts and confrontations grow out of interactions among people.

Traditionally the principal is pictured as a very busy man, preoccupied with putting out fires. It is the here and now that dominates his thinking. In the proposed new team configuration, the principal is the chief planner.

Violence may not disappear in the short run, but may intensify. The new breed of principal will be neither frightened nor foolhardy in the face of violence. As the executive at the attendance unit level he will prepare a crisis management plan. He is responsible for keeping the attendance unit in tune with the times, getting it prepared for what lies ahead five or ten years hence, as well as now. This insures that lead time and study are available for a rational attack on problems.

The Leadership Challenge

The good old days are gone. All that schmaltz about the time when pupils obeyed willingly, teachers responded with alacrity, the community appreciated what you did without question, and the corridors were pictures of peace and quiet no longer exist. The times are out of joint for the principal if all about him changes, but he or she as professional leader remains the same. I believe that the principalship will have something positive to contribute if it is perceived as having the qualities of platinum, a metal called precious by some and expensive

by others. One common point brought out when I taught high school chemistry was that placing two or more chemicals in a test tube will not necessarily insure a reaction or, even more important, that a desired compound will result from the reaction. Very often the application of heat and pressure fails to promote desired results. A special agent, which does not in and of itself take part in the activity, is often required to stimulate the reaction toward the desired objective. It is called a catalytic agent. Platinum is often used in chemical processes as a catalytic agent.

There are many resources, human and material, available in most school systems. Resources represent potential. The proximity of resources to each other, even placing them in juxtapositions will not automatically insure that something desirable will occur. It is wishful thinking to believe that better texts, ETV, CAI, instructional technology yet undreamed of, or any other resources brought to teachers will in and of themselves produce desired outcomes. In complex institutions some means, devices or agents are necessary to bridge the gap between inputs and desired outputs as well as to stimulate activity toward institutional objectives.

Leadership is a force which can initiate action and interaction among people, as well as between people and other resources, guide activities in a desired direction, and maintain such activities as unified efforts toward common goals. It implies that leadership is directional by nature, and therefore, there is no such thing as non-directive leadership in an administrative post. A leader should not be confused with that bland personality, cheerfully meshing with other bland personalities — "the bland leading the bland." The times suggest otherwise. Group activities are means and not an end in itself. Like a platinum catalytic agent, a principal adds that certain something which is as yet difficult to describe and explain, but when successful it is readily apparent by the outcomes in progress of complex institutions. Its effect is not unlike what Keynsian economists call the multiplier effect. A relatively small amount of effort applied at one level is magnified as it affects other levels. Whatever else the new breed may be, however often the roles may change, the importance of the principal as a catalytic agent in a complex process of education will always be demanded.

Often a catalytic agent, even though not consumed in the process may grow tired and stimulate no more. On such occasions neither a fresh supply of platinum nor a recharging of the old must take place. New preparation programs may be designed for a long-run solution to the problems facing the principalship. The short-run demands those now in the position to build the new skills and insights to continue to improve education. It is the sensitivity of the principal to his impact on the processes within the school system and in relation to the environ-

ment that is important. The position will endure only insofar as the individuals assigned to a leadership post stay in tune with the times. It demands excellence as never before.

Working with today's teachers will always remain important for principals. Unions and aggressive professional associations merely hasten the process of new maturity for teachers. The aggressive demeanor can be explained in part by the deep hunger to be a significant part of a creative enterprise and a strong desire among teachers to achieve professional self-respect and self-determination. Greater economic security is not the only force which drives teachers to the streets or has them assume unbecoming behavior patterns in an effort to precipitate educational change. Professional negotiations have altered previous relationships and principal-teacher relationships will never be what they once were. The contract is the end product of collective bargaining. Administration will always be needed to execute such contracts. Leadership will be in a different style, but it will still be in demand and of importance.

As John Gardner once observed, "Very few have excellence thrust upon them. They achieve it. They do not achieve it unwittingly by doing what comes naturally; and they don't stumble into it in the course of amusing themselves. All excellence involves discipline and tenacity of purpose." If there is to be excellence in school administration it is imperative to sense not only that "she ain't what she used to be" but also "what she might be."

Many have suggested criteria of success in administration. Some qualities a principal must have to cope with in today's world are: the sharpness of a fox, the heart of a tiger, the persistence of a bulldog, the strength of an ox, the hide of an alligator and, of course, the agility of a gazelle. And he must prove that he can function with the financial genius of a Rothschild banker, the foresight of a prophet, the ethics of a saint, the diplomacy of an ambassador, the public relations ability of an inveterate charmer and the judgment of a Solomon. The successful principal can, must and will satisfy all these demands and still find time to love his wife and family.

I join the many who declare that there not only will be a need for effective principals, but add: "As the principal, so the school." We have not developed a better way to ensure effective educational programs, harmonious faculty relations, and improved learning outcomes at the very important building level.

Publications

The Bureau of Educational Research and Services

Educational Services Bulletins

22. **First Year Principal's Conference Proceedings,** Merwin Deever, February, 1967 ..... $1.00

23. **Proceedings of the 6th Annual Invitational Reading Conference,** Laurel B. Boetto, October, 1967 ..... $1.00

25. **First Year Principal's Conference Proceedings,** Harold B. Hunnicutt, January, 1969 ..... $1.00

26. **Proceedings of the 7th Annual Invitational Reading Conference,** Laurel B. Boetto, June, 1969 ..... $2.00

27. **Staff Personnel Conference Proceedings, 1969,** Harold E. Moore, May, 1969 ..... $1.00

29. **Supplementary Materials for the Teaching of Reading,** Jann Skinner and Phoebe Slaughter, 1969 ..... $2.00

30. **Proceedings: Second Annual Junior College Conference,** Donald Bridgman, July, 1969 ..... $1.00

31. **Proceedings: Staff Personnel Conference, 1970,** Harold E. Moore, January, 1970 ..... $1.00

32. **Philosophic Contributions to Socio-Psychotherapy,** Frederic Mitchell, Robert Rein'l, James Skelton, 1970 ... $2.00

33. **Proceedings: 9th Annual Education Round-Up, 1970,** Raymond Wochner and James Carpenter, April, 1970 ..... $1.00

35. **Proceedings: 10th and 11th Indian Education Conference, 1969/1970, Center for Indian Education,** February, 1971 ..... $2.00

36. **Proceedings: Staff Personnel Conference, 1971,** Harold E. Moore, January, 1971 ..... $1.00

37. **Attitudes of Arizona Educators Toward Sex Education,** Nelson Haggerson and Naomi Cohen, April, 1971 ..... $2.00

38. **A Selected Bibliography of Print and Non-Print Media in the Audio-Visual Field,** Pamelia Eck and Marcella Bethancourt, May, 1971 ..... $1.50

40. **Recommendation From a Data Base for Comprehensive Change at Phoenix Union High School,** Joe Eddie Lopez, Robert Grinder and Michael Clark, May, 1971 ..... $2.00

41. **Proceedings: The 3rd Annual Junior College Conference,** Quentin Bogart, July, 1971 ..... $1.00

42. **A Taxonomy of Subject Matter Presentation,** James E. Fresier, December, 1971 ..... $2.00

43. **At the Crossroads: The American School Administrator,** William G. Walker, February, 1972 ..... $1.50

44. **Proceedings: Staff Personnel Conference, 1972,** Harold E. Moore, January, 1972 ..... $2.00

45. **Developmental Counseling,** H.D. Richardson, May, 1972 ..... $2.50

46. **Proceedings: 4th Community College Conference,** May, 1972 ..... $1.00

47. **Proceedings: The 5th Community College Conference,** February, 8-9, 1973; May, 1973 ..... $1.00

47a. **Proceedings: 13th and 14th Indian Education Conferences,** 1972/1973 ..... $2.00

49. **Proceedings: 15th Indian Education Conference,** 1974 ..... $2.00

51. **Competency-Based Administrator Preparation,** November 21-22, 1974 ..... $2.50

52. **Competency-Based Preparation of Educational Administrators,** February 2-3, 1976 ..... $2.50